THE NEW IDEAL.

VOL. III. APRIL, 1890. No. 4.

THERE ARE TWO SIDES THAT ARE ONE.

"THE anti-slavery movement did not grow until the leaders got to quarreling among themselves: then the world heard of us!" said Wendell Phillips, in the last address I heard him deliver. The present social movement seems destined to grow from the same cause. The noise of the spears hurled by Liberal hands upon the shields of Bellamy, Gronlund and the friends of Nationalism, tell by their hurtling that the question is up for discussion.

But the antagonism is only in seeming. It is more an antagonism of methods than of principle. And is not this seeming antagonism necessary to the evolution of the principle of Brotherhood,—that it may externalize itself in methods?

As I read both sides I am forced to admit that each is true. All are true. Every affirmation, by whomever made, is true. As long as one speaks what to him or her is truth, that affirmation is a true ray, converging towards the Absolute truth, and is in harmony with every other affirmation. Every utterance of truth is a stone for a massive cathedral, and not of necessity are any two stones alike; each one has its place. An individual may tell of some things that are — but he cannot, because of human limitations, tell what are *not*. The moment one steps out of the legitimate sphere of a truth-teller, into that illegitimate one of a teller of error — one who tells what is *not*; a denier of others' affirmations — that moment inharmony is born and evil is sown. It is the stone in the foundation finding fault, and denying place to one destined for tower or façade.

The field of truth is that of affirmation. "Nerve us with incessant affirmations," says Emerson; "omit negative propositions. Don't waste yourself in rejection, nor bark against the bad, but chant the beauty of the good." Two can no more see Truth the same than they can stand on the same square foot of ground and see the same horizon. To each is it given to see an infinitesimal arc of the infinite circle, and when, through every finite mind, all of

Truth is evolved, that circle will be complete. In the negative of every discussion do we find this necessary limitation. Negations reveal, like an unwise general, the weak points, and there invite the attack.

In the speeches and writings of those who are to be considered as teachers of Nationalism and Socialism, I fail to find those things that critics attack; but I do find stated in those speeches and writings the very principles laid down by most of the critics in their affirmations.

When Mr. Potter, Mrs. Dietrick, and Mr. Powell, in THE NEW IDEAL, affirm principles, I find harmony between them and the principles of Nationalism. Those principles will work out in accordance with the varied humanity that accepts them as true and that makes them the motor of life. The trouble is not in the principles, but in the heterogeneity of humanity.

For illustration: I regard Mr. Powell's recent work, "Our Heredity from God," as one of the very few great books of the last decade. The author declares himself opposed to Nationalism. From beginning to end it seems to me a treatise on Socialism. Often, during the last two years, I have gone to it for argument, for encouragement and stimulation as a Socialist. Every forward step through evolution has been equally a step into a more perfect individualism and a more perfect association. The two cannot be dissociated. They are the two sides of the great facts —life and civilization. "Our Heredity from God" is what "Looking Backward" makes no claim to be,—a scientific and ethical exposition of natural law. Through it breathes the spirit, and it teaches the principles, of Brotherhood and the Golden Rule,—which spirit and principles are the inspiration of "Looking Backward."

Cannot these differences be reconciled? They do not lie in human nature itself, but are only the result of undeveloped conditions that cause partial, or a one-sided, examination. It is in fact only a discussion as to where the emphasis is to be placed.

"The Word of God was made flesh." Shall we place the emphasis upon "Word" or upon "flesh"? Shall we find Causation in Spirit (or energy, if this is preferred),—or in Matter. Is man the result of the inner life working through environment, or is he the result of the environment working upon the inner life-principle? As we decide these questions we shall decide for Socialism or for Individualism.

But there is another question. Are not these forces in equipoise, and thus these questions, and all discussion of them, ruled out as useless and irrelevent? Are not both Socialism and Individualism true? True, because of the fact

that the action of the ego and the reaction of environment, and the action of environment and the reaction of the ego, are equal!—that the ego and environment are co-ordinate and ever-present factors, acting simultaneously in the production of every phenomenon of life? While evolution is true, while every law known as Darwinism may also be true, these other things are also true,—the law of Compensation, the Duality of Nature. "Things seen are temporal; things unseen are eternal"! Life is Matter and "something else"—"something super-added," says Tyndall. That something else is the unseen balance of the seen. Call it energy, spirit, or God, it is only the other side of the phenomena we call life. In Psychology as well as in Physics action and reaction are equal. In this equality, it is possible to harmonize the spiritualistic and materialistic philosophies, and in political economy the Individualist and the Socialist.

It is evident that any conclusion reached by ignoring one of these two sides of life, and any theory or scheme based upon such imperfect conclusion, will be erroneous. Society has made progress by constantly shifting the emphasis from one side to the other, and civilization results as the diagonal of the individualistic and socialistic forces.

Competition is Individualism. It means each for himself. Success is to be won, if necessary, by pushing, elbowing, crowding, treading upon the neighbor. It develops the egoistic at the expense of the altruistic faculties. But both in equal development are necessary to a well-balanced character and a just condition of society. Nature will not be ignored, and the principle of association has been growing, under competition, until, permeating every avenue of business, legislation, society and charity, we find combination and co-operation. Now, the demand is made to shift the emphasis of public opinion to the side of co-operation,—for the advance is not needed along the whole line. The selfish propensities under competition have become abnormally developed, and now the order is, "Forward," to that wing of the army representing the socialistic side of society.

The selfish tendency has been equally abnormally stimulated by the church, which has dealt almost wholly with the "kingdom of God," and neglected the kingdom of Man. God and man are ever in equipoise, and this equipoise is found in the Great Commandment whose second portion "is like unto" the first. Love to man has been forgotten in its teachings. The cry, "Save your soul," is a selfish cry, and is born of the competition of the market. Thus the influence of the church has tended away from human brotherhood. Theology, like Political Economy,

has been Individualistic. The evolution of man and that of his environment must go hand in hand, each acting and reacting upon the other. The heralds are prophets.

This evolution has ever tended to hero-worship on the one hand and denunciation on the other. Both the denunciation and the worship are errors, but the underlying principle is truth. Symbols have ever been and still are necessary for the masses. To worship the symbol for the thing — the form for the principle — the method and not the reform — is not the mistake alone of ecclesiastic and priest, but also of patriot and teacher, of political economist and reformer. Can Socialism and Individualism be entirely free from the worshipers of method and men?

In this worship of the seen for the unseen arises the worship of heroes and the denunciation of tyrants. Washington and Grant are applauded by those in whom the sentiment of loyalty is dead. Jesus is worshiped by those who have lost his spirit in love of form or creed. Even so to-day do Gould and Vanderbilt stand in the minds of the masses, not as the incarnation of the principle of competition, to which the condemners are equally obedient in crowding each other for work and in cheapening of goods, — they are held to be the cause and not the consequence of the conditions that appear. To the clear-sighted reformer and philosopher these millionaires are simply illustrations of the principle, and are no more responsible for their position, as controllers of millions, than are those who, by encouraging and abetting them, have made them, as the balance of pauper and unemployed — both the results of a false economic system.

"We war not upon individuals," is the declaration of every Nationalist; "we would substitute a just for the present unjust system." Systems develop individuals, and individuals institute systems. Through competition, co-operation has become necessary. Those who see this are in duty bound to incarnate that principle in as perfect a system as is at present possible, that the system may, by its action, produce better men, who shall again act upon the system to its betterment. Thus Individualism and Socialism are both at work in every movement, and each person must at once be both Individualist and Socialist, only a little more at any one time of one than the other.

Competition is as necessary to humanity as co-operation. But each must keep its place. Cannot the golden mean of equilibrium be found? Nationalists think they have found it. By co-operation they would render life secure, by securing to each the means of life through labor. They would, through this security, obtain the leisure needed for the development of the intellectual, mechanical, esthetic,

social and moral powers of man, and leave it to competition to stimulate him for growth and position in mechanics, invention, science, art, literature and goodness.

H. H. Brown.

TRUTH FULL ROUNDED.

The knowledge of truth as it is in Nature, inclusive of the various mechanic arts, is only one kind of truth and one form of its application,—and these the lowest. This domain of physical truth, vast and momentous as it is, needs to be included in and balanced by that larger realm of truth which is both intellectual and moral. It needs this balance and enlargement of relationship in order to insure its full and permanent beneficence for man.

Mere knowledge alone is power, but it is not always nor necessarily beneficent power. The human mind may be educated to great ingenuity and skill in certain directions, and yet the intellectual life as a whole remain narrow, shallow, and unfruitful, and the moral nature lie dormant or even be perverted and enslaved to evil. What, indeed, is most of all wanted in order to make available for the highest uses that human power which results from conquest of the truths of Nature is secure establishment in some truth that is deeper and higher. No advancement in the physical sciences and arts, no accumulation of material power and riches, can promote man's highest good without a corresponding increase of moral perception and accumulation of moral power. All material civilization, however splendid, is but a gaudy, empty show if it does not ascend to moral and spiritual ends. Boast of our modern civilization as we will, and though we claim that it is bulwarked against peril by the printing-press and the public school, yet we can never be sure that it will not lapse into another dark era of barbarism, or a social condition of things as bad as that, unless it be penetrated through and through with moral ideas, and consecrated by an ideal moral enthusiasm. This wonderful progress of mankind through the discovery and application of the truths of material Nature must be guided by the constant and higher application of the truths of the spirit. Popular liberty will find no stable throne nor lasting crown until the realm of material forces is subordinated to the power of ethical laws.

And it must be admitted that there is much in our modern civilization that is unsatisfactory and unsound. Its dominant activities spring from and appeal to motives that are selfish and sordid. While it has lifted us out of the

depths of traditional ignorance and gross degradation, it has nourished vices peculiar to itself. It has fostered an unwholesome love of gain, irrespective of the rights of fellow-men or the calls of human sympathy. It has whetted certain appetites of the flesh to a keener edge. The Chinese government has in vain besought Great Britain to keep the deadly opium-drug of her civilization at home. Missionaries in the new Congo State in Africa, which was to civilize the negroes through commerce, find their work paralyzed because of the rum flowing in there from civilized — ay, from Christian — England, Holland, and our own Boston. If our civilization has brought us immense power and freedom over Nature, it has also brought a new bondage. Millions are enslaved to its mad lust of gain. The quiet domestic virtues go down before the rushing train of material enterprise. Homely honesty is often eclipsed by the blinding dust and smoke. Justice and humanity may get on board, if they can, but the express-train bound for the terminus Plutocracy cannot stop for them. Commerce rules; the manufacturing interest rules; gold rules; trade sets up a moral standard of its own quite different from the golden-rule of Jesus and Zoroaster and Confucius. This great country of ours tried to live for nearly a century with a dreadful lie in its bosom,— proclaiming equal rights for all men, but legalizing the enslavement of black men because cotton was king. "The higher law"— that was all transcendental talk and touched not the earth. For practical life there was no higher law than expediency.

This, I believe, is no exaggeration of what modern civilization has been on its evil side. I acknowledge that it has another side. I recognize the vast power the human race has acquired through use of the forces of Nature, and the magnificent foundation thus laid for future achievements. But in order that these achievements may be secured and the evils of our present one-sided civilization be neutralized, there should be the same fearless pursuit in the discovery and establishing of intellectual and moral truth. We are now applying to life for the most part only one fragmentary part of truth. We want the whole truth, full rounded in all its constituent elements, to make individual life worth the living, and worthily to complete the unfolding drama of human history. Our material civilization is only a basis on which mind and heart and soul are to rear their structures. What high art should come, what literature, what poetry, what philosophies and humanities, what equity of law and administration, what social fraternity, what strength and graces of personal character should appear, as the legitimate sequence of this conquest of Nature by the powers of mind! The true, the just, the

beautiful,—not till these shall rule in private, in public, and in national life, will our present era of material civilization be worthily crowned.

But there are many who aver that these higher truths of the human soul are impracticable; that they must remain as ideals in the sky, while practice must come down to a lower level, more nearly in accordance with the methods in vogue around us. Here is one of the strangest delusions that the world has known,—yet it is a delusion that has assiduously been kept up from age to age,—that truth is not so practicable as error; that a half-truth is stronger than the whole truth; that wrong and falsehood may be perfectly practicable, but their opposing truth, though clearly known, is impracticable. If this were so, it would be the strongest argument that could be offered against there being any valid basis of truth or any moral purpose in the universe. The delusion is born of a skepticism that is thoroughly atheistic. Assuredly, the highest moral truth known to man is practicable. If it isn't practiced, the fault is in human character and does not spring from any cause in the nature of things. And what better evidence can be had that any truth, whether of religion, or of science, or of ethics, is meant for human use than that it has come within the scope of human intelligence? Or what better intimation of the time it should be put to use than the date of its discovery? That, at least, is the time when all who understand and acknowledge it should begin eagerly to labor for its supremacy, content no longer that any error or half-truth should occupy its place. And yet people parley, defer, compromise, evade. They say in effect: "Excuse us, O Lord, but this truth of thine comes altogether too soon for safety. Next year, or next century, the world may be ready for it. But now it is utterly impossible to get it established. To attempt to disseminate it will produce only a vain agitation and bitterness. Pray, take it back to thyself again. Keep it hidden till a more auspicious season, and leave us for the present harmonious and happy in our error." But to such timid parleying the answer always comes back from the source of truth, "Now is the acceptable time, now is the day of salvation." And if we try to pass this reply unheeded and still put aside the truth that is knocking at our doors for admission, then sooner or later the inevitable stern voice of retribution will ring through the chambers of conscience, proclaiming "the day of vengeance of our God." That ancient scripture still has a meaning for mankind. It means the dread retribution that by natural law follows the fracture of righteousness. Truth cannot be safely tampered with nor violated. This is the lesson of all history; the lesson of individual life and of every nation's annals.

Nothing can be more fallacious than the idea that individual character ever derives any greater efficiency from lowering the standard of truth or virtue to make them more practicable, or that any half-way rule of honesty will work better than the perfect rule. You will see men enough, it is true — there are, alas, too many of them — who have attained a certain outward success, a certain measure of influence and power perhaps, through methods of concealment and trickery. We may sometimes see fortunes accumulated through extortionate and fraudulent practices in trade; vulgar demagogism, cunning, and hypocrisy, mounting to places of high trust and authority in the community; selfish ambition riding rough-shod over the unostentatious merits of solid wisdom and moral sincerity. All this we see, and a hasty inference might be that, in this world, hypocrisy succeeds and truthfulness fails, that fraud is rewarded and honesty punished, quite as generally as the reverse. But it would most certainly be a hasty inference. Look through a lifetime, look at people in the mass and in the long run, and the rule is that men find that level to which their characters respectively fit them, and stand in the community for what they really are. There are some exceptions to this rule, but they are exceptions and do not make the standard. They are enough to suggest that this life may not complete the moral course, that there is somewhere a beyond for rectifying the judgments of the earthly life. Yet even here, in general, it is reality, genuine worth, that reaches the highest places of respect and achieves the truest success. You may say that here is a man who lives respected in the community, though on ill-gotten gains. But he does not have your respect, he does not have the respect of any one in the community who knows with you of his dishonest ways. It is to be put to the credit of human nature that no compromise of personal integrity, no evasion of personal truthfulness, ever wins regard from others or retains power over them. Sooner or later the fraudulent disguises are exposed. The flimsy veil of outward respectability is blown away, and power vanishes with it. It is only truth, reality, that ultimately commands.

And what is true of individual character, is true also of communities, of nations. No community or nation was ever made strong by a compromise of justice. Personal and sectional interests, merely outward and material matters, may be compromised for the general welfare; but the right and the true never. The majority may not support nor even comprehend the highest political truth. Let them, then, put into act the ideas that belong to their level and keep the responsibility therefor; but let not those who do see the truth that is needed yield one jot or tittle of it

because it cannot be enacted to-day. If they cannot be legislators, let them be prophets. Stronger is the man or the party that stands for the truth, though in a minority and having no official power, than the man or the party that may possess all the insignia and patronage of office, but denying the truth. Better wait a whole century than help to enact a lie or even a half-truth, if the half-truth can only be obtained by a compromise against the other half. The proverb sometimes preached in such cases, that a half-loaf is better than no bread, does not apply to any question where the point yielded is a point of morals. For then the half-loaf is not bread, but a stone; not food, but poison. Every national compromise of justice legalizing an injustice brings the inevitable retribution of corruption and disease in the body politic, which only the bitter discipline of suffering can expiate and cure.

Nevertheless, back of all and through all, there is one "stream of tendency" which is never to be forgotten, and which is always the world's strength and the sure hope of mankind. It is the pressure, from the hidden Source of all sources, Cause of all causes, of the absolute truth itself toward the realization of its own ideals in human character and society. Steadily, firmly, under this divine pressure, there come solid gains for man. The millennium is still far away. The Elysian fields are not yet in sight. But, even in our own time, the burdens have been somewhat lifted from over-burdened shoulders. The chains of oppression have been loosened, and some of them broken forever. Miseries have been somewhat assuaged. Hope and honorable aspiration have been stirred in hearts that never knew them before. Knowledge, culture, and refinement have increased. Justice and good-will and brotherhood are rising to higher thrones in the sovereignty of nations. Thus slowly, but surely, do the great moral ideas and purposes, which crown the universe with a fitting noble aim, work their way into the heart and life of humanity. The power in the world that makes for truth and righteousness is patient, but it wins at last. All history substantiates the truth that there is a power in the world — not simply above it or outside of it, but in it — that is reconciling the world unto itself; bringing it into harmony with its own ideal aims; shaping and fashioning it to the service of truth, goodness, and beauty. Let us call that power our God: God with us: God working in man, and through him, and for him.

"One God, one law, one element,
And one far-off divine event,
To which the whole creation moves."

W. J. Potter.

PROFIT-SHARING.

In the current discussion of economic methods, a brief outline of an article by Prof. J. Shield Nicholson, in the *Westminster Review*, concisely summing up the advantages of Profit-sharing, may not be without value.

The professor points out that the principle on which profit-sharing as an industrial method is based, is that the work done will vary according to the interest of the worker in the result. The fact is mentioned that the Romans, the greatest of ancient agriculturists, discovered that slave-labor, exacted by fear and torture, was inefficient, and they wisely established a system by which the cultivators of the soil became interested in the amount and quality of the produce. This system grew into the one that still prevails in the south of Europe, by which the landowner provides the capital and receives a share in the produce, usually one-half. The land-and-stock lease in England, by which the stock was let with the land, and the owner took a considerable part of the risk, was analogous to profit-sharing in the partial identity of interests created. This proved a great agency in the emancipation of the serfs and the establishment of the yeomanry. Conducting fisheries so that part of the reward of the workers depends on the success of the business; allowing the shepherds, as is common in England and Scotland, to keep a certain number of sheep of their own, so that they may have a direct interest in the welfare of the whole flock; and payments by commission in addition to a certain fixed salary, serve to illustrate the variety of forms the profit-sharing method has assumed, and the widespread application of the principle. This plan of conducting business has been considered successful generally.

Of profit-sharing, in the strict sense of the term, Maison Leclaire is regarded as the father, for he made the first experiment in this line, of which John Stuart Mill in his "Political Economy" gives an account. Since then, experiments have been made in every European country and in the United States. But, for some reason, profit-sharing has not received much attention from practical business-men. In Great Britain there are not more than thirty firms that have adopted profit-sharing in the specific sense of the word, and the number of laborers they employ does not exceed 10,000.

One reason why this plan has received so little recognition among the English-speaking nations, which have taken the lead in most industrial reforms, Prof. Nicholson thinks is that the economic value of moral forces, except of the

most obvious kinds,—as for instance, trustworthiness in a manager,—is not recognized, or is under-estimated. "The chief reason," he says, "why productive co-operation is a comparative failure is, that the value of business capacity is underrated, and efficiency is sacrificed to nominal cheapness in management. It may be allowed, then, that in analogy with corresponding business methods, profit-sharing may be perfectly sound and practicable in spite of the fact that it has made so little headway. Any one can see the value of a new mechanical process; but an improvement in the mechanism of human motive-power is not so easily understood."

If the employer is to pay ordinary wages, and divides profits beyond a certain rate between himself and the workmen, it looks "as if the master was compelled to pay the market-rate of wages, but to receive something less than the market-rate of profits." And by this system, while the laborers receive a part of the profits in the prosperous years, the employer must meet the losses of a depression during bad years. M. Leclaire's reply to this objection was that under the stimulus of profit-sharing the laborers would create the additional profits they were to receive. The fact that the system has worked well, that there are in the world one hundred and fifty establishments that have adopted it, that the proportion of failure under the system is much below the average, and in most cases due to extraneous causes, would seem to show that it is possible for wages and profits to rise at the same time, and that the profit-sharing system may be relied upon to secure the extra care and economy, immunity from strikes, etc., needed to secure the result.

Prof. Nicholson believes that profit-sharing is capable of a much wider extension than it has yet attained, but he is satisfied that the first condition of success is that practical business-men realize the nature of the economic principles on which the system rests. He does not doubt that, from its general adoption as a matter of business, most favorable moral and social results would follow. "The constant effort to make the most of the concern," he says, "the creation of a keen *esprit de corps* among the workers, the knowledge that, to a large extent, the interests of masters and men are identical, the application of a share of the profits to social purposes, the opportunity for the gradual accumulation of capital out of extra earnings, and the consequent sense of independence—all these are factors which make for the moral elevation both of masters and men, and tend to diminish the friction between classes."

B. F. Underwood.

APPRECIATION.

To LIFT from Self the eyes,
To greet in glad surprise
Our own unspoken thought in others' work,—
This is the sight divine that lighteth life,
Albeit, within the silent soul it lurk,
Voiceless, half-blinded midst the dust of strife.

As vestal virgins fair,
Untouched by mortal care,
Once kept the sacred fires of gods aglow,
So doth appreciative love, as fair,
Our altar-spark now keep, where sweet and low
Life's prophecies are chanted to our ear.

What we appreciate,
That shall we yet create,
In thought, or word, or work, or here or there.
What matter here or there, or mine or yours!
One Spirit is the All, and everywhere,
Through changing face and transient form, endures.

W. G. TODD.

OUR HOPE OF IMMORTALITY

AS VIEWED BY AN AGNOSTIC.

IN the resistless onward march of thought, and high development of the human brain, it is only natural that the speculative mind should turn aside from the superstitions and traditions of earlier years, and strive to attain something higher, nobler and better as a plan of salvation and immortality. The web of time-worn creeds, woven into childish story, that was suited to the superstitious phases of the Middle Ages, will not satisfy the intellect of the nineteenth century. Slowly but surely the science of Darwin, of Huxley, of Tyndall, the clear reason and common sense of Montgomery, of Cope, of Powell and Fiske, are honeycombing the very foundations of the old religious beliefs. We are awake, alert; we are seekers after knowledge. And dawning light brings true knowledge.

Evolution, with its gradually unfolding light, has dawned upon our minds, and in its clear radiance we see ourselves as part and parcel of the grand plan of Nature, which has been working its chemic forces for millions and millions of years. We can stand up like men and women and feel in our souls that we are the grandest product of Nature, and not a mistake of a Creator who missed his mark in everything he aimed at, and failed at the outset in his plan of perfection. Advanced thinkers for many years have been opening the way for this fine revelation, which is now

accepted and believed in by a large majority of the thinking people through the civilized world.

What are we? Evolutionists, materialists, free-thinkers, atheists and agnostics. The last term is the more general one, and, while not so sweeping as some of the others, yet expresses all that ostracises us from religious people. An agnostic differs from the so-called atheist, in that he is not cynical concerning religious beliefs. He has no sneers for the manifest incongruity of nearly everything which is insisted upon in the evangelical creed. He is simply one who has looked into and studied Nature, and sadly confesses that his mind is incapable of receiving as credible the prevailing theories of religious belief, in their rudimentary and imperative principles.

An agnostic cannot conceive of any personalized Deity; but sees, in the mighty mystery which surrounds us, a correlation of forces called Nature. Are we disbelievers in a personalized God by inclination, or by force of the reasoning powers with which we were unconsciously endowed? It is only reasonable to hold that every person would prefer to believe in a personal Deity, and in a future existence planned for us from the beginning. Who would not delight to solace himself, for the cares and disappointments of the present existence, could he do so rationally, with rose-tinted hopes of peace and pleasantness, surrounded by those he loves here, in an existence to come? Would it not be infinitely "pleasanter" to rest content in the hope and trust of an immortality purchased for us vicariously, and which, according to some of the standard creeds, will be ours whether we earn it or not? But if we are born reasoners how can we accept these theories? If the instincts which tell us that they are theories erroneous and pernicious are part of our very natures, and will not be eliminated, what can we do in the matter? Many people are agnostics from necessity and not from inclination. If a voice has spoken to us deep and strong, and a handwriting has appeared on the wall which reads, "Immortality is *not* a purchasable commodity," can we silence the voice, or erase the handwriting, and force back and stifle our reasoning faculties which reject as unnatural and untrue the glittering plan of salvation which has come to us from the dark ages of the past? In all cases let us be true to ourselves, and to the promptings of our educated natures.

It is perhaps unquestionable that deep in all our hearts is a desire for a future existence; — and to be an agnostic does not necessarily imply a future without a hope. The rather, the agnostic who has a firm faith in Evolution sees life in everything, and recognizes to the fullest the supreme

yet simple truth that no one knows when or where life began, nor, any better, whither it shall tend, or whether it is endless. The supposition that life, in any form, cannot utterly cease, is only a reasonable one.

The agnostic has no fear of death, for, being a philosopher, he knows that, as we came, so shall we go. The old stories of the terrible scenes at the death-beds of atheists, which were used by ministers of the gospel as their best stock in trade with which to frighten and awe the progressive minds of wide-awake boys and girls, have been relegated to the obscurity which they merit, or exploded in the light of philosophic facts. Dr. Shrady asserts (and he is a believer in the Christian religion) that, so far as his experience goes, the people most unwilling to meet death are, in every case, those who have always been professed believers in Christianity and the bible. On the other hand, the same excellent authority asserts that those who reject Christianity and all cut-and-dried plans for a future existence, and are willing to except life and death and all that each may bring to us as part and parcel of the great plan of a deep, inscrutable, mysterious, yet in the main beneficent Nature,— that those who believe all this, and in believing it rest content, are the ones who look upon the hour of death as a deep and component part of Nature's laws, realizing that to die is just as natural as to live.

The accounts of the shadowy worlds to which we are to be carried "on flowery beds of ease" fail to satisfy the philosophic mind. Even the "Second Adventists," who in this point at least seem more practical and less visonary than other Christian denominations, realized long ago that they wanted substance instead of air, and so have most ingeniously construed the bible to suit their own more practical ideas. They boldly assert that they do not want any "sky heavens, but something more tangible to rest upon"; so they are coming back to this good old earth, after it has been purified by fire, to reign with Christ at his second coming. To be sure, it savors of the wild and grotesque, to think of their being "caught up in air," and held floating there, while the wicked ones below (agnostics included) are being reduced to ashes; but then, they get their belief from the infallible book, and if they are honest in it (and no sect is more so) they have as undoubted a right to believe in their errors as the holders of any other creed have.

Do we need, or require, tangible evidence of a future existence? We know that the life-current thrills in everything. We may or may not believe that this current is imperishable — what matters it? We shall never know, while in the mortal, the mysteries that await solution. But the inference, to the philosophic mind, is that everything will

at least be natural. Ethics tells us to work and love, and to live in such a manner that the unborn millions who shall follow after us may inherit virtues and health rather than vices and disease. If we believe that the hands, now dead and gone, of the countless thousands who have preceded us into the mysterious realms of death, have pushed us with invisible force into the place which we now occupy, have we not a higher incentive, in that belief, to live rightly and purely for the sake of those who will one day tread in our footsteps and feel our silent force pushing and urging them up the shining heights of virtue and morality, than to curb and bind our ideas to the selfish end of a heaven of rest, prepared for us as a reward for worshiping a personal God, and for believing in the blood of Jesus as an atoning power?

At any rate, whatever the end may be, we have faith to believe that it will be all right, and in perfect accordance with Nature's laws. And in this belief we rest content. We want no "sky heavens," where we shall be separated from those we loved on earth.

> "What to me are time-worn creeds,
> Web of barbarous names and deeds."

The deeper feelings of our hearts, wherein we nourish and cherish hopes of a continuous life, are sacred to ourselves. Whatever these hopes are, they are hard to define and to put into tangible shape for the analysis of the critic. They are not to be paraded for public show, like the "sure knowledge" of the Christian, who pins all his faith and hope upon the printed pages of a book. We trust life, and in the same sense we can also trust death. The Christian asks, "What have you got to sustain you, when your loved-ones pass away?" We answer promptly, "The assurance, for one thing, that they no longer suffer." And then we inquire, in return, "What have you got to sustain you? You cannot be certain that your loved-one has gone to endless bliss, instead of endless misery."

Why should *not* the broad, rational belief of the agnostic be a better, inasmuch as it is a more natural, sustainer, than the narrow, irrational belief of evangelical Christians? They are sure that there are two distinct and separate places whither go those who pass away from earth. Just how they can surely know for which place *their* friends are destined is one of their unexplainable mysteries. How infinitely higher, nobler, more satisfying, is the calm faith which realizes that, with regard to death, "whatever is, is right," and lays its loved-ones away with the sure knowledge that

> "They have the best
> That Heaven itself can give them,—rest."

How vain, in the hour of death, are the creeds and beliefs of a bygone age. No dream of a spatial heaven, no vision of crowns or white robes, can reconcile us to the thought of our loved-ones slipping out of our sight — whither we know not. In spite of alluring pictures of waiting angels, or even the personal attendance of Jesus himself, we must "tread the wine-press alone." If sometimes "the rapt and parting spirit" reads "a mystic meaning" in the visions which come to it while etherealized by the near approach of death (a state of feeling which can be largely if not wholly explained by physical and psychical laws), in such cases, let both the living and the dying derive all the comfort they can from the phenomenon. It can do no harm, and is certainly better evidence of immortality than all the "inspired" books which were ever written. The sweet and glad smile which appeared on my mother's face, more than an hour after we thought her dead, was better evidence to me that she had met and recognized the husband and children who had preceded her into the silent land, than all the theories and dogmas that were ever expounded for the benefit of "darkened intellects."

There is no reason why we should not meet death precisely as we meet life, — just as we greet the morning, and just as we meet the hour for retiring. In a majority of cases, pain comes naturally to lessen our hold on life, just as weariness precedes the desire for sleep. Even the act of death should hold no terrors for the rational mind. The so-called "death-rattle" is simply inability to swallow the saliva, — an inability occasioned by the fast weakening powers, — and may be greatly mitigated by administering a little wine and water, or clear water. The sluggish flow of carbonized blood to the brain deadens all active suffering, and we may reasonably suppose that the dying one suffers no more than we do when we fall asleep. Sleep is, after all, as great a mystery as death, and we know as little of the workings of the mind in one case, as we do in the other. If we live rationally and temperately, we cannot fail to pass away in a similar rational manner, and, whatever the issue may be, it will be in perfect accordance with the harmony of Nature.

HELEN N. PACKARD.

PRIMITIVE MAN.

MAN, whence and whither? These problems have puzzled all the ages and perplexed all the philosophies. If the most advanced doctrine of Evolution be true, and if not only the complex physical organization of Man, but his

royal intellect as well, have been compacted of the nebulous mists of the ancient heavens, the mystery and wonder are intensified in manifold degrees, and man becomes a greater enigma to himself than ever.

"We walk between two eternities," said Diderot. "Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting," writes Wordsworth. Says the Sphinx, in Emerson's Poem:

> "Who'll tell me my secret
> The ages have kept?
> I awaited the seer,
> While they slumbered and slept;—
> The fate of the man-child;
> The meaning of Man;
> Known fruit of the unknown.". . .

Something, however,—thanks to the science of late years, which has supplanted the former guess-work that went by the name of science,—is known of the character of man's life upon the earth prior to historic records; and the same science is pressing hopefully onward to open new avenues of exploration, and to perfect such knowledge as we possess.

In our course of lectures last year we were amply instructed as to the present accomplishments of science on the question of the "Descent of Man." We are now, in a supplementary way, to inquire what has been the life record of man since the period when first he stood forth as truly man, asserting through some superior, though at first, slight prescience, his mastery over the mere brutes that perish. If the conclusions are subversive of some cherished legends of the historic past, yet here, as on so many other lines of Evolution, we obtain a more unified and coherent, and thereby a more reverent conception of the totality of Nature and of Man, and may be reconciled to the loss of that which the more credulous past held worthy of belief; for as these myths of ancient times have enriched the imagination, and stimulated the faith in an Unknown, so have they entered into the life of the Present, which is the sum of all the Past, and have but been transformed into loftier ideals.

The establishment, within a recent period, upon a satisfactory scientific basis, of the fact of the great antiquity of man upon the earth, was primarily due to the results of investigations regarded, at the time, as of but slight consequence, and therefore, like so many other preludes to the discovery of important scientific truths, wholly undervalued, and, indeed, for a considerable time, wholly disregarded. The credit of inaugurating the line of research whereby has been ultimately demonstrated the existence of primitive races for tens, if not hundreds of thousands of years anterior to all historic records, belongs to the French

scientist, M. Boucher de Perthes. Possessed by the energy and enthusiasm of a truly scientific spirit, he devoted himself from the year 1836 to 1841 to a thorough exploration of the ancient caves, peat-mosses and diluvial deposits in the vicinity of Abbeville, and in the valley of the Somme, in France. During this five-years' labor he unearthed a large quantity of flint weapons and tools of various kinds, evidently shaped by artificial means, having surfaces and edges roughly chipped, and obviously designed for use as spears, arrow-heads, axes, knives and hammers. The question immediately suggested was as to the age of these implements. To this geology furnished a reply. The objects were found to be incrusted with material of a yellowish tinge, clearly not due to the substance of the objects themselves, but to the ferruginous nature of the soil in which they had been imbedded. In a certain layer of the diluvium was found the character of such deposit as would have caused the incrustation, and, if the objects were imbedded in it at the time of its formation, some approximate idea could be obtained as to the age of the implements. "If," as he says in his report upon these investigations, as quoted by Prof. Joly in his work, "Man before Metals," "they were in the bed from the beginning, the problem was solved, and the man who made the implement was anterior to the cataclysm to which the deposit owed its formation. In this case there was no possibility of doubt. Diluvian deposits do not, like peat bogs, present an elastic and penetrable mass" (*i.e.* a mass into which objects could have been forced by various external agencies), "nor do they, like the bone-caves, present a gaping chasm, into which objects might have been thrown by torrents, or into which they might have been conveyed by men or animals, but, on the contrary, each period is sharply defined. The layers are disposed horizontally, the strata differ in color and substance. If this work of human hands has remained there from the first, as irremovable as the bed itself, then it had a prior existence, and these rude stones, in all their imperfections, prove the existence of man no less surely than such a building as the Louvre itself could have done." This was evidently a true scientific induction, inferred in accordance with the well recognized scientific formula that the opposite of the proposition cannot be conceived as true.

Notwithstanding assertions to the contrary, the bulk of evidence indicates that Quaternary man from the most remote period was in possession of fire. According to one authority it was known to him as far back as the Miocene, but the proofs do not seem to warrant this belief. But in the case of the earliest cave men we find numerous hearths,

ashes and cinders, bones wholly or partly calcined, and fragments of hand-made pottery blackened by smoke. Prehistoric man of that period cooked his food, therefore,—perhaps not after our fashion, but possibly as among certain present savage tribes, by the application of heated stones, or in water heated by such means. His food was not carefully chosen, as it seems to our taste. Mammoths, the rhinoceros, beavers, dogs and foxes were on the bills of fare.* Marrow was a great dainty, as is evident from the quantity of the long bones of animals which have clearly been broken for the purpose of its extraction. Fire was probably obtained by friction in various ways, as among existing low races. Palæolithic man possessed no cereals, nor had he domestic animals or agriculture. For his sustenance he contended with the wild and ferocious animals of his time, as is evident from many skulls of beasts fractured by flint weapons. His clothing necessarily was furs and skins, to prepare which he evidently used the flint scrapers which are so abundant. Pins of clay or bone were used to fasten the clothing, though in the so-called reindeer-age rude sewing was effected by bone needles. Of social customs we have no trace, although, if we judge by analogy of existing savage tribes, both polygamy and polyandry were practised. Of the earliest men we discover no remains of dwellings. They contended with the cave bear and cave hyæna for shelter in the natural cave formations. It was a struggle for existence in the utmost acceptation of the phrase, and that from such an unpromising environment the race should have risen to its present high standard of social and intellectual advantage is not one of the least of the wonders that the philosophy of Evolution offers for our reflection.

We must further briefly note that the numerous carvings and designs of species of animals now extinct, which have been discovered on many of their fossil bones,—frequently exhibiting a very considerable ability in outline delineation, and superior to anything produced by the lowest or even somewhat advanced races of to-day,—are an important contribution to the proofs of the antiquity of man, and equivalent in fact to any others which have been adduced.

It is not improbable that the very earliest races were wholly devoid of any sentiment of what we call religion, or habits of worship. The lowest tribes of which we have any account in historical records appear to have possessed some instinctive recognition of superior powers, and we discover none in which some rite of propitiation and sacri-

*The recent discovery by M. Armand Vire, of palæolithic flint-hooks, which had evidently been used as fish-hooks, and the prevalence of palæolithic spear-heads in the river-drift, indicate that fish was also a common food of palæolithic man.

fice, or funeral ceremonial at least, has not prevailed. If primitive man exhibited any religious, or, at any rate, theistic observances, they must have appeared, of course, in forms of the lowest and most degrading fetishism, inspired only by fear. But the question must remain largely speculative.

Z. Sidney Sampson.

LEAVING THE OLD FARM.

I want to get up right early, wife, when the dew is on the grass;
To-morrow's the only day we'll have in the dear old home to pass;
For then we must say good-bye to the things we've always held
so dear,
And somebody else 'll take the farm I've worked for many a year.

I went, just now, to yonder church we was married in, long ago,
And saw the grave in the yard behind, where we laid our little Joe;
And I that never let fall a tear on the day that baby died,—
The thought o' leaving here touched me so that I sat right down
and cried.

It's thirty-five years ago, my wife, just thirty-five years to-day,
We was moving in, and settling down, as chipper as birds in May;
We had'nt no great amount of cash, but we 'lowed to buy the farm,
For we put a deal of faith, you know, in the strength of my right
arm.

And didn't I plan the fields right well, and didn't you sew and spin?
If hearty good-will 'ud boast folks up I'm sure we'd ha' made it
win.
From early morning till late at night we was always on the race,
A-trying with all our might and main to pay for the dear old place.

Sometimes we was down at the mouth, o' course, and sometimes,
for a spell,
We'd think we was booming right along and a-doing pretty well.
But there was that blamed old mortgage, wife, a-hanging around
our feet,
The int'rest eating our profits up like the weevil does the wheat.

We brightened up when the babies come,— those rollicking girls
and boys;—
How they made the old house ring, my dear, with their chatter
and their noise!
And we kept 'em cosy and warm and snug as linnets in a cage,
And we hoped they'd stay to comfort us in the time of our old age.

But after a while I begun to see they wouldn't be content,
For the life was dull, and the work so hard, and one by one they
went.
And Jim and the girls they're far away, and the twins was lost
at sea,
And there ain't a one of all that flock that is left to you and me.

But we staid on, and in spite of the work and trouble, and the care
That has brought the silver threads so thick in your pretty, soft
brown hair,—

In spite of the fact that our life has been a losing fight with debt,
We cling to the old place yet, my dear, we cling to the old place yet.

We've just grown into the ground, you know, like the elm-trees
in the yard;
We're wonted, now, to this sort of life, and leaving it comes right
hard.
Oh, well, it's a tough old world, my dear, and toughest for them
that's poor;—
If they hope at first, they soon must learn to suffer and to endure.

There was a time, if you recollect, and it wan't so long ago,
When I used to curse them fellows East that's a fleecing of us so,—
A-living in style, and guzzling wine, on the money that they've lent,
While we poor dupes is a-working here to pay them a big per cent.

But now I'm a-getting too old, my dear,—such thoughts don't
bring relief;
There ain't no room in my heart for wrath,—there's only room for
grief;
And I see it ain't no sort of use for to grumble and complain,—
The man that works with his hands can't cope with the man that
works his brain.

But, though it's been plain that we couldn't stand the int'rest they
imposed,
It gave me a dreadful shock, my dear, when the mortgage was
foreclosed.
I'd just been hoping against all hope we'd get some short reprieve,
And it nearly broke my poor old heart when the notice came to
leave.

And Jim has writ us a letter, now, a-telling us both to come;
We never shall want for bread, he says, so long as he's got a crumb.
Yes, Jim was always good, my dear, but he's got a heavy load,
For there ain't a one of his seven girls that's knee-high to a toad.

He says there's a fact'ry standing near, and he's sure he'll find
me work,
And I'll try to do the best I can,—he'll see that I ain't no shirk;
But it's hard to teach old dogs new tricks, and though I'll work
with a will,
It's pulling a load up hill, my dear,—it's pulling a load up hill.

So I want to get up early, wife, when the birds begin to sing,
And we'll go all around and say good-bye to ev'ry well-known thing;
To the orchard there, and garden, and the lane where we used to
walk,
And the porch where we always sat at night to have our little talk.

And we'll take a stroll in the meadow-path beyond the maple-tree,
Where the children used to come trooping down to call me home
to tea.
And we'll pat the cows, and the horses too,—I hope they'll be
well used;
I 'low I'd turn in my grave, my dear, if Robin sh'd be abused.

It ain't just leaving a house, you know, or a barn, or bit of land,
But it's swerving off from the path we've trod so long, dear, hand
in hand.
And it seems so hard to go, my wife, it seems so hard to go,—
I almost wish we was both at rest by the side of little Joe.

NELLY BOOTH SIMMONS.

PARACELSUS.

One of the belles of the Browning Club in Philadelphia, an association with three hundred members, recently went to a library to get a copy of a book they were studying, and which, she said, was called, "Parolcus." What she meant was a poem by Browning, published in 1835, a few months later than the appearance of "Sartor Resartus," soon after the achievement of Parliamentary Reform, in the early days of Puseyism, and in the full heat of that great political, religious and philanthropic agitation, which soon found its highest prophet in Emerson, and finally abolished slavery.

Browning went back to the time of the Protestant Reformation, and found a hero in "the Luther of Medicine," the daring young doctor who startled all Europe by declaring that disease was not to be studied in ancient authors, but in its most recent victims, and that the best remedies were not given by blind faith in tradition, but by keen observation of existing phenomena. "He who would know Nature must trample on books," said this reformer, who was far in advance, not only of other doctors in his own day, but of many teachers in ours. He followed a literary fashion, common in the sixteenth century, and changed his name, Hohenheim, to one designed to show his superiority to a petty author of an old Latin book, designed to help every man to doctor himself according to time-honored oracles. Or, perhaps, it was to show sympathy with one of the early skeptics, that our hero called himself Paracelsus, meaning that Celsus had been surpassed by him, or at least equaled. His haste to get rid of the authority of the past led him to rely so confidently on his own intuitions as to fall into strange vagaries, which prevented him from reforming medicine as completely as he might have done. He did succeed in bringing some valuable remedies, like laudanum, mercury, and the compounds of antimony, into general use; but his books are now as obsolete as those he burned at his lectures; his disciples were few; and he died in poverty and exile.

The poem follows out his history with sufficient accuracy, but attributes his failure to that haughty, egoistic and unsocial tendency, which has occasionally shown itself among the followers of the broad-souled Emerson, and which sank into actual misanthropy in Carlyle. Paracelsus avows, in the first part of the poem, his longing —

> **"At once to trample on yet save mankind."**

A warm-hearted girl warns him that, even if he succeed in his wild search after knowledge, his lack of sympathy

must make him wretched. Nine years pass, and he finds himself solitary, disappointed, and in despair. Then he meets a poet, who has sought only after the beautiful, and, having found this aim too narrow, is dying in remorse. One has sought only to know, the other only to love; and both have found their aims too narrow. Paracelsus accepts the death of the poet as a warning to cease his solitary wanderings, and to devote himself to teaching what he has already learned.

The third part of the poem shows him at Basel, a popular lecturer and successful physician, as for a time he actually was. He never ceases to regret the failure of his original attempt to find the secret of the universe; he meets with little success in his efforts to make his admirers adopt what he calls principles "chiefly of the overturning sort"; he shows too much scorn of ignorance; and his loss of faith in himself leaves him open to temptation to dissipation and deceit. These errors, together with quarrels, first with a patient and then with the city authorities, oblige him to leave Basel in haste and disgrace. He resorts once more to his own wild life, but with little hope that it will do anything better than preserve him from falling utterly a victim to sensuality and despair.

We next meet him, dying in a delirium, which makes him see beside his bed the shining form of the dead poet, and also the dark shapes of those Greek, Jewish and Arab physicians from whom he has taken away their crowns forever. At last, he rallies his strength, rises from his couch, and declares to a friend, who has often remonstrated with his wild schemes, but is faithful to the end, that he feels himself saved and pardoned. He has striven to enlighten man and declare God's glory, and thus he has "done well, though not all well." He regrets, among other errors, that of delay to see that knowledge is

> "Not intuition, but the slow
> Uncertain fruit of an enhancing toil."

He had learned too little from the experience of his predecessors:

> "Not so, dear child
> Of after-days, wilt thou reject the Past
> Big with deep warnings of the proper tenure
> By which thou hast the earth; the Present for thee
> Shall have distinct and trembling beauty, seen
> Beside that Past's own shade"

Such are the salient points in the outline of a poem which I have felt all the more at liberty to abridge, because a much more complete account has just been published, by Mrs. Fanny Holy, of St. Louis. Her "Outline Study of Browning's Paracelsus" contains most of the best passages,

with all the comments needed to link them together. She also gives some very interesting facts about the Paracelsus of history, from a recent biographer, Hartman, who acquits him of the worst charges which had been made by less friendly writers, and which have found their way into the poem. She lays more stress than I have done on the embodiment, in Browning's hero, of "the undue straining toward heaven and the infinite life," leading to rejection of the conditions of earthly usefulness and happiness; and I do not say that she is mistaken, but it is simply justice to her to present this as her view rather than mine. I wish to recommend her little pamphlet for its beauty, not only of thought and style, but of outer form. It has one especial merit which is not always conspicuous in Browning literature, namely, that of being intelligible, instructive, and interesting from first to last.

F. M. Holland.

THE MODERN WAY OF "GETTING THERE."

"In almost every mill or factory may be found two men starting with equal wages, one of whom will rise steadily, while the other will as steadily lose ground, or barely hold his own. The same ladder is before both. Where then lies the defect which makes one fail to follow the other's upward round?"

These words of Mrs. Dietrick, in her interesting article in the February New Ideal, have been more or less on my mind ever since I first read them. They vividly reminded me of some of the story-books I used to get out of the Sunday-school library when I was a boy. It is so long ago since I read these that I have forgotten names and places, and all minor incidents connected therewith; but the main features of these stories are still fresh in my memory. They ran something like this:

John and James were both apprentices in the same manufacturing establishment. John was always industrious and attentive to his business. He never slighted or shirked his work; and, without having any selfish end in view, he was ever on the lookout for such chances as might enable him to advance his master's interests. All the way through these stories, John was presented as a paragon of goodness and faithfulness. James, on the other hand, stood in almost the same relation toward John that Mr. Hyde did to Dr. Jekyll. He was idle, untrustworthy in every sense, and years afterwards, when John was enjoying all the pleasures of his well-earned reputation as a self-made man, James was nothing but a poor, miserable, rum-soaked

wretch, who was just kept from absolute starvation by his hard-working wife who took in sewing or washing for a living.

It should be noted that these stories were written in a time when trusts, syndicates and huge corporations were unknown. Twenty-five years ago there were comparatively few enterprises carried on which were so large that an employer could not become personally acquainted with his "hands." Then employers of labor could easily see for themselves the difference in the value of different workmen. Self-interest alone would dictate the wisdom of such action, which, either through an increase of pay or elevation of position, would secure permanently the continuance of faithful, efficient service.

Every aged working-man can remember the time when the only conditions necessary to attain a fair degree of success in life were good health, industry and temperance. It was possible to secure more than this if one were fortunate enough to have special fitness for the occupation selected. Laborers were not so plenty then that talent could go to seed and merit hide itself away from all reward under a bushel. These were the times when the first part of my quotation from Mrs. Dietrick would have been strictly applicable. In fact, it is applicable, in a great degree, to the present; — but the implication is not the same.

After eighteen years' experience in different manufacturing establishments, I feel forced to the conclusion that real merit plays, in the greater number of cases, but a small part in enabling one workingman to rise above another. If you should go through a large industrial establishment, and find a workingman that gets more pay than another who works by his side, do not think that the difference in the pay always represents a difference in skill and ability. In very many instances the one who gets the lower pay is the better workman in every sense of the word. Nowadays the men who represent a manufacturing company or corporation have no more personal knowledge of the men in their employ than a general has of the privates in his army. Salaried superintendents do the hiring, after which they are turned over to the tender care of a set of drivers, known as "bosses" or "foremen." It is with these latter that workmen come in direct contact. An indispensable condition of any hoped-for success, in any factory or mill, is, first, to be on good terms with the boss. The reasons should be obvious; but, perhaps, a modernized version of the story of John and James will explicate the matter better.

John and James were two mechanics who worked side

by side, at the same bench, in the same shop. Both had hired out for the same wages, say, two dollars a day. Both were what might be called average workmen. John, like his namesake in the Sunday-school stories, was steady, sober, and industrious, and believed in doing a fair day's work. He had one great fault, however, and that was to be outspoken in his views on political, social or theological subjects, whenever an occasion arose that made it seem to him his duty to be so. Unfortunately for him, his views were considerably at variance with those of such people as do their thinking mostly with somebody's else brains. He prized his manhood, his mental independence; but as such things are a serious impediment when, for the sake of success, it is necessary to display a spirit of toadyism, he soon found himself sinking very low in the estimation of his boss.

It so happened that the representatives of the corporation, in view of the approaching presidential election, directed the superintendent to instruct the bosses to sound the "hands" on the tariff-question. John told his boss that the doctrine of Protection was, in his opinion, a humbug of the biggest kind; that, in practice, it was nothing but absolute, downright robbery, and he should consider it his duty to combat the doctrine every time he had an opportunity. Here was a good chance for the boss to make a little capital for himself. John's declaration was reported to the superintendent, embellished with all such variations as usually come in handy for the purpose of enabling a boss to boost himself in the good opinion of a company, even though some workingman is most unjustly crowded down thereby.

The next day John was called into the office. He was told that, in view of the fierce competition in the line of their own manufacture, which they had to endure from the pauper-labor of free-trade England, it would be necessary to dock him twenty-five per cent. on his wages. John told the superintendent that this was only an excuse, and a poor one at that, to cut his wages, and that it was a greater injustice yet to single him out from the rest of the men for this purpose. But he was coolly informed that there was nothing unjust about it at all, as it was in perfect harmony with the individual contract-system which every political economist of note pronounced to be perfectly right. If he didn't like the cut, why, there was no law in the world that would prevent him from going elsewhere, if he so wished. John felt that it would be a luxury to leave; but he could not afford to run the risk of using up all his spare savings in hunting for work in other shops, where, if his name were not blacklisted, the conditions would

undoubtedly be the same. As a successful mechanic John was a complete failure.

How, on the other hand, was James getting along? James was rising steadily all the time. He had more ambition than skill, and he made up his mind from the first to be, if possible, the favored one of the two individuals, who in every mill or factory succeeds in "getting there." Soon after he hired out he learned that the superintendent of the shop was also superintendent of the Baptist Sunday-school, and that his boss was the teacher of the bible-class. He had no special love for Sunday-schools, but, for all that, he became, to all appearance, a most enthusiastic pupil; and the studied deference which he paid to the opinions of his teacher were so flattering that the abnormal love of approbation of the boss was inflamed to the desired extent. This was the means by which James was helped to get a good strong pull on the boss, which, nowadays, is more than half the distance up the ladder of a workingman's success. As a matter of expediency James found that it paid well to postpone his habit of reading the *Police Gazette* on Saturday evenings, and study the "Notes on the International Sunday-School Lessons" instead. Through his connection with the school he finally became acquainted with the superintendent. A judicious application of "soap" produced the desired result. He became a teacher himself, — and then it was surprising how often it was necessary to confer with the superintendent on some matter connected with the lessons.

In the shop he took special pains to inform the boss, or the superintendent, of any defection he might see in any of his shop-mates. In some way, which no work on political economy has ever attempted to explain, this most always raises a workingman's pay, or elevates him in position. James was no exception to this rule. When the Home-Market Club sent an agent to the shop with a "frying-pan," James was called into the office in order to reflect "the views of our intelligent class of workingmen." He reflected them so well that the superintendent made him a boss; and now he aspires to the position of superintendent.

There are very few manufacturing establishments which do not have men employed that accurately represent the characters of John and James. The success of a workingman, in some cases, is actually a question of personal capability and worth. But I believe that in the greater number of cases it is simply a question of skill in pulling wires. Look at the facts in the case. A workingman is employed in a mill or factory, from which he knows he can be discharged at any time, at a moment's notice. He

knows of many cases where discharges have had no better excuse than a mere whim or caprice. If he is a free-thinker, and his employers, as they generally are, are zealous church-men, he knows that it is bad policy for him to freely express his views. If his employer is a strong Protectionist, who is particularly fierce in his denunciation of those who would sweep away our pirate tariff, he knows that he must be very careful about having it known that he believes in Free Trade. He may be ignorant; but he is not so entirely lacking in sense that he cannot read the implied threat on his pay-envelope, which cordially invites him "not to vote against his own best interests." If he believes in social reform; if he maintains that the wage-earner is nothing but a slave, because he cannot labor without the permission of the few who own the land, the capital and the machinery, he knows how extremely obnoxious he will become to those who, financially, are already safely established.

Consider what an inducement is held out to the working-man to be hypocritical, to be dishonest, to become, to the extent of his ability, a wire-puller, a sail-trimmer, when our starvation-system of industry furnishes such strong motives for a self-smothering of true manliness, and places such a crushing veto on expressions of moral fearlessness. For such a deplorable state of things I see no other real remedy than Nationalism.

Geo. H. Hadley.

THE DOGMA OF INFALLIBILITY.

In childhood the individual usually, without questioning, accepts the parent as authority in matters of belief. With increase of years, if of inquiring mind, it reasons on its own account. Limitations on the part of the parent come to be perceived, — limitations constitutional, and limitations imposed by connection or partnership with an older generation. A German historian truly observes, There is no abstract humanity; and Goethe has said, Every great man is linked to his century. We may add that the lesser great men are linked to their generation. To the past stock of facts and ideas each succeeding generation adds others. Even the unthinking masses of men feel the pressure of this accumulated knowledge, and absorb from it unawares. So the sons are ever pushing back the horizon of the fathers, letting in more light to reveal the vast possiblities of the future. "Every age has another sieve for tradition, and will sift it out again." Man is both fallible and progressive.

Society, like the individual, has its childhood of simple faith; the quality of gullibilty rests heavily upon it. In a savage state it looks to some strong man as endowed with unquestionable authority, even to the disposition of life. He who exhibits superiority in physical power and dexterity is worshiped as a god. In time comes priestly mediation, with endless rites and ceremonies, believed to be essential in worship. Perhaps they once were, considering the low condition of society. The rulers and priests strengthened their authority by acting as though delegated from on high. Civil and religious rules of conduct, thought to be prescribed by God himself, must be accepted as infallible. So the first decalogues of man get themselves respected by the multitude believing in their supernatural birth. The supposed intimacy of Moses with Jehovah on Sinai did magnificent service in restraining and directing that "stiff-necked and perverse people," on behalf of a better justice and social relationship than they were capable of appreciating.

The first organized government is a theocracy, in which the voice of the priests is the voice of God. But theocracy gradually becomes monarchy. The first kings, however, are annointed by the priests, and sanctified from above. The king rules by divine right. His voice is the voice of God. The maxim is, The king can do no wrong.

Experience, however, proves the fallacy of this; and among peoples sufficiently capable of political progress, government takes on the features of aristocracy — a government by the few. The Greek language designated men of birth as the good and true. The voice of the nobles then was the voice of God. But imperfections in the nobility are perceived. They prove to be not always wise and good. They prove to be monopolists of privileges; rulers in their own behalf. Sometimes the king and nobles fall to strife among themselves. Sometimes personal ambitions create division. The people are called upon for service, and inducements offered. They acquire some appreciation of their importance. Bargaining for rights and privileges ensues. Like the camel in the fable which sought shelter in the Arab's tent merely for its head, but gradually pushed in the whole body, the commons secure one advantage after another until they get completely inside the ship of state, and control its movements. The government becomes a democracy. The voice of God now is the voice of the people. *Vox populi, vox Dei,* is the maxim.

Government by the will of the majority, however, is soon also seen to be very fallible. Selfishness and ignorance lose none of their power for mischief by being massed. Rather does their power become increased. The rule of

the majority, as well as of a king or an aristocracy, may be unwise and a tyranny. Thus is it found that there is no political polity men can devise that is infallible.

To view the subject under another aspect in reference to political life — how prone we are to rest on the bosom of the fathers in determining matters of State policy. For nearly a hundred years, scarcely any question of moment has arisen that the intentions and opinions of the founders of the Republic have not played the largest part in the discussion. What did Alexander Hamilton, or Thomas Jefferson, or James Madison say? No matter what the changes; no matter how different the conditions, if a dictum or declaration of theirs can be tortured into support of this or that opinion it is counted an immense gain. When the restoration of silver was agitated, its advocates had the magic shibboleth, "the dollar of the fathers." In every tariff discussion we are treated to endless quotation from the framers of the first insignificant tariff-bill of 1789. Of such weight with us is the authority of the past,— the authority of minds legislating for a country sparsely settled with 3,000,000 of people, with infant industries, and a crushing protective system prevailing throughout christendom,— that the twenty-fold increase of population, the marvelous diversification of industries, and vast material changes, count for little in forming our judgment. It has taken some three generations of men to outgrow the fetish-worship of the Constitution. Every encroachment of the slaveocracy, until the culmination of its political iniquities in the Fugitive-Slave Law, found warrant in that instrument.

Truly we would not appear to speak flippantly of that wise and patriotic galaxy of men who established our republic. We trust we have due reverence for their memory, and appreciate the grandeur of their work. Hamilton, with his penetrating and logical mind, his clear perception of principles and their consequences, his patriotic endeavors for national unity, and for the general interests of the nation rather than the particular interests of a State; Jefferson, with his political idealism, ardent love of individual liberty and of local self-government, his humanitarianism, his larger faith in and sympathy with the masses than Hamilton had; Madison, broad and just in his statesmanship, serene, judicial and tolerant in passionate times, the chief maker of the Constitution, and, perhaps, more genuinely American than either of the others, — these, not to extend the list of the fathers, may well arouse in us the profoundest admiration and gratitude. They were intellectual giants, and earnest men, in those days. But time reveals their limitations; and we only desire to indicate

here how the disposition of man to repose too much in the shadow of past authority discourages that brave and self-reliant reasoning which accelerates the march of progress.

In the realm of jurisprudence how overpowering is precedent — especially with the Anglo-Saxon race. Respecting this trait of the English, a profound political philosopher* has cleverly observed: "If it be necessary to modify the laws in any respect, to adapt them to the changes which time operates in society, recourse is had to the most inconceivable subtilties in order to uphold the traditional fabric, and maintain that nothing has been done which does not square with the intentions, and complete the labors, of former generations. The very individuals who conduct these changes disclaim any desire of innovation, and had rather resort to absurd expedients than plead guilty to so great a crime."

This extreme deference to the past, and to the authority of great ones, is perceivable in all departments of knowledge. So overshadowing was the genius of Michael Angelo that Italian painting for half a century was little more than a spiritless imitation of him. Even in science, which is least affected by the tendency, there come halts when the human mind seems to stand still. The authority of Plato and Aristotle paralyzed the European intellect for centuries. "What did Aristotle, or Plato, say?" was the question to be determined, — not, What are the facts? So firm was the English faith in Newton, on account of his wonderful discovery of the law of gravitation, that it required a century for the undulatory theory of light to become accepted, in place of the emission theory which he had advocated. So great was the authority of Descartes that French scientists resisted, nearly as long, the gravitation theory; while their veneration for that truly comprehensive naturalist, Cuvier, has kept them to the rear of both English and Germans in the immense department of biology.

But the dogma of infallibility in religion principally claims our attention. Respecting this, with how many even yet is it a mistaken supposition that the experience of christendom is exceptional. Human nature is indeed much alike, the world over. Much there is in common between European and Asiatic civilizations; between the Ancients and the Moderns. Max Müller tells us that the Brahmins of India "displayed greater ingenuity than even the Fathers of our church, in drawing a sharp line between profane and sacred writing." However contradictory the doctrines taught by their earlier and later scriptures, their orthodox theology pronounces them to be equally absolute

* De Tocqueville.

truth. Systems of philosophy, says Mr. Müller, "opposed to each other on very essential points, always try to find some kind of warrant for their doctrines in one or other passage of the Upanishads."

The other branch of the Aryan race, which became Persian, made another bible, the Zend-Avesta. This was also believed to be literally inspired. Buddha and Zoroaster came to be invested with the character of gods; and their teachings received the stamp of infallible truth.

Orthodoxy with the Greeks required belief in the literal truthfulness of the myths and genealogies of Homer and Hesiod. He who first proclaimed disbelief was doubtless a brave heretic. But we know that the tide of philosophic speculation rolled in upon the Greek civilization, until the doctrine of infallibility, applied to their scriptures and oracles, was generally rejected by the cultivated classes.

The Romans had a somewhat similar experience; while the science of the Arabians was arrested, though happily to a less extent than in christendom, by the infallible Koran of Mohammed.

In reference to the Jewish people, we behold a like, and, perhaps, severer application of this dogma. Every judicial decision and dictum; every observation of the Sanhedrin, the supreme court of the Jews, was sought to be harmonized with the intentions and sayings of the fathers. Progress, political, social, educational, religious, must be made by the authority of Moses and the prophets. The most ingenious reasoning and interpretation were necessarily resorted to in the effort to secure their sanction. Hillel, as President of the Sanhedrin, claimed this sanction for his high judicial and moral maxims; while Jesus presented his sublimest ethics as based on the law and the prophets.

The Jewish bible, with the New Testament, having become the infallible bible of christendom, an infallible authority was required to interpret it. The Catholic church invested itself with this most dangerous power over European society. We need not dwell long on the abuses resulting therefrom. We all know how fatal it was to intellectual freedom and development; how the rack, thumb-screw, and fire, were so many instruments of intimidation to the progressive thinker; how the orthodoxy of every new book or public utterance had to be pronounced upon by church authorities.

Protestantism cast overboard an infallible pope, but clung tenaciously to an infallible bible. Hence the reign of many creeds, instead of one creed. Religious truth was still prescribed by human authority in some Augsburgh Confession, or Thirty-Nine articles of the English Church, or estminster Confession of Faith. Free inquiry and

thought were still greatly trammeled by this bibical superstition.

How many scientists have missed the mark by laboring under the supposition that they must find authority for their views in the Hebrew bible,—which makes no claim to teach science! For instance, palæontology, in the effort to account for fossil remains, was much hindered in growth by the absurd notion that they were relics of the flood which deposited Noah's ark on Mt. Ararat. To the end of the 17th century, the diluvialists, especially in England, sacrificed common sense on the altar of their creed that the Noachian deluge was the cause of all the past changes on the surface of the earth. Even to this day some of our geologists divide the pre-historic life of the earth into six periods of time, to square with the six days' cosmogony of Genesis.

Our greatest concernment lies in the fact that this dogma has impeded our moral, not less than our intellectual progress. What sin, individual and national, has skulked under its shadow! An ambitious pope, wishing to increase his temporal power, recognizes and crowns the usurper of a kingdom. Did not scripture furnish the precedent? — the prophets of Israel had annointed subordinates to rule their country. Did a Christian general desire, or deem it expedient, to slaughter the innocent? Moses had set a fearful example. Did a European potentate wish to replenish an impoverished treasury? He had but to confiscate the wealth of Jewish subjects, whose commercial and trading sagacity made his kingdom prosperous. By so doing was he not the humble instrument for fulfilling prophecy? A class of humanity preferred polygamy to monogamy. Straightway they founded a Mormon despotism on the authority of the Old Testament. Do a class of noble women claim equal rights with men? The endeavor is made to silence them with the authority of St. Paul's injunctions to a contentious little church, more than eighteen centuries since. The Southern planters thought slavery essential to their industrial interest; forthcoming in their pulpits were the proslavery passages of the Pentateuch. No marvel, that the church at the North should be lukewarm in the early days of the Abolition movement. Why should it give aid and comfort to Garrison, Phillips, Sumner, Frederic Douglass, in their warfare on an institution sanctioned by the word of God? Respecting the relation of this dogma to-day to personal morality, why should A. or B. regard himself culpable for deceit or sharp practice in business, when the favored son of Isaac so took advantage of his own brother's imperative hunger as to exact his birthright for a little bread and pottage, — afterwards stealing the blessing

intended for his brother by a trick played upon an old father on the verge of the grave?

Illustrating no further, must not such a doctrine be pernicious to the morals of both old and young? To teach that all passages of the Bible are equally inspired is to discourage the exercise of that discriminative and selective power whereby conscience grows. Let us be rational enough and honest enough to condemn without reservation that which wounds the moral sentiment, however plainly declared by any book to be commanded of God! The Greeks — pagans, as we call them — had humanity enough to visit retribution on the characters in their myths, for revolting acts, even when committed by order of, or sanctioned by, the gods themselves. We like that line of Euripides, —

"If gods do ought dishonest, they're not good."

The soul of man is stronger than institution or dogma. The one is a progress, the other a station; the one the musician, the other the instrument. Verily, the son of man is lord, not only of the Sabbath, but of every other institution of State or church; for he hath made them only as stepping-stones to an end, not as the end itself. The step is not the stairway; the stairway is not the upper chamber with its outlook over a wide prospect of beauty and diversity. The stairway creaks and trembles with long use; the stairway is not the owner of the stairway,— he cuts it away and builds stronger and better. Even the chamber, aforetime so delightful, ceases to satisfy an enlarging taste and aspiration; the chamber is not the owner of the chamber — he builds it anew to meet his demand for more beauty, more sunlight and air, wider prospect still. Dogmas and institutions, once serviceable, under the footprints of accumulating thought lose power to serve, and become pitfalls to the upward striving of the human soul. When so perceived, why should we hesitate to declare them out of court, or apologize for so declaring them? Do we apologize for removing the spinning-wheel to the garret,— or for setting it in the hall to be a reminder of what once was? Do we apologize for using the self-reaper and binder, because Jesus knew of nothing better than the sickle? Do we apologize for using the telephone, electric light, sleeping-car?

This dogma of the one infallible book, which it took even Unitarians themselves a long time to outgrow, is now fast losing hold of thinking minds even in the more conservative churches. The desire to harmonize that which is unharmonizable causes a latitude of interpretation, and a twisting and omitting, which virtually deny acceptance any

longer of the literal inspiration of the bible. Abundant evidence of this may be found in the evangelical literature of the day — in its books, periodicals, sermons.

As the result of this change of belief concerning the bible, there will be an increased, rather than decreased, appreciation of all that it contains truly helpful to man. There will come a higher appreciation and reverence for the character of Jesus. If he were the "very God," is not his example shorn of its truest grandeur and significance? It is precisely because we feel that he was the son of man, having a nature similar to ours,— subject to conflict with the tempter, with wilderness devils subtle in suggestions of ambition, of appetite and passion; subject to betrayals, to misunderstandings, to heart-aches, even to misgivings and fallings of faith,— that we can revere his memory, admire his moral heroism, his purity, his devotion to truth.

In wholly freeing ourselves from this dogma of infallibility, we shall be blest by a greatly enhanced power of discrimination as to what is wisdom, inspiration, righteousness; blest, also, with a livelier appreciation of the diversified genius of the world, blest with a deeper sentiment of universal brotherhood. Man shall exercise his sovereign right to select that which is most nourishing to the soul, and construct his bible, as a beautiful mosaic, from the finest gems of truth, minted in the inspired souls of all the nations of earth. This will be the bible from which our children, or our children's children, shall draw the water of life.

GEO. W. BUCKLEY.

EVOLUTION.

A WORD — no more — for by-gone time —
For seasons bloomed and passed away:
O heart! a sacred echoing chime
To link the past with this to-day!

Not mine the voice to lift to thee,
O wondrous year, disruption's cry!
I wander on thy spacious sea
And make my truce with every sky.

For, somehow, night — this night — hath drawn
My heart so near to lips that blessed
The by-gone days, I breathe the dawn
That softly all their love caressed;

And doubting stands no more the host
Upon the threshold: all my song
Is bathed in flush of daybreaks lost
And grown in fervid memory strong.

HORACE L. TRAUBEL.

ETHICS AND WOMAN.

The ethical rule is that we should treat others not as means to our ends merely, but as also ends in themselves. One of the first changes which, as it appears to me, the adoption of such a rule would bring about, is in the current ideas of woman. It is impossible to accept the ethical rule and yet regard woman as existing for man's sake.

It is true that woman is (at least, physically) weaker than man; hence as a rule she has been made subject to him. Volumes have been written to prove that this was her natural, God-ordained relation to man. Religion has often reflected this opinion, and taught woman that obedience and submission were her sacred duties. But the subtle inspiration of all this argument and ecclesiastical teaching has been man's selfishness. The animal nature in man, not only his lusts but his love of power and his pride, had led to the common estimation of woman, which is only just beginning to be dissipated. Marriage itself, that most intimate and sacred of all ties, that symbol and blossom of love, has been perverted at times by man's selfishness into the worst of all tyrannies, because the most secret.

Almost every step in the direction of independence for woman, whether in or out of marriage, has been contested by man; and almost every step has been sanctioned by the principles of morality. Once men thought that they had a right to capture women and subdue them by force; even now marriages are sometimes arranged for them — formerly they were purchased outright, now the process is more insidious; until lately, they could not own property in the married state. Everything — what belonged to them, and their own persons — became, it was supposed, by marriage, man's property. Outrageous it was, yet most natural while man's moral nature was not aroused and the animal in him still ruled.

And let us not think that the changes in woman's position and rights have yet reached their completion. If essentially she does not exist for man's sake, but for her own; if, whatever relations she enters upon with him, she does of her free will and choice, then, in marriage and out of it, she must stand on substantially equal terms with him. Let husbands give up the notion that their wives belong to them, that their grace is in submission and sacrificing themselves for them, that they have no rights over their own person; let respect and honor come first, and love be but the blossoming of these sentiments, not their destroyer, — and shall we not, as citizens, be ashamed to claim rights that we are unwilling to extend to women?

If we have any essential right to determine what portion of our property shall go to public uses, how can we deny a similar right to women? If we feel that we ought to have a voice in the making of the laws we are to obey, why think that we alone can feel so? Or if the whole matter of political "rights" is not one of rights, but of privileges and duty, founded on capacity, why recognize capacity in a man and deny it in a woman?

I confess that for myself I cannot follow the sweeping claims of the woman-suffragists. But of one thing I am sure, — that, so far as the opposition to that reform springs from the selfishness of the male sex and its assumption of superior natural rights, it is rotten and doomed to failure. "Cease to think thyself a born lord on the earth," is perhaps as applicable to the average man of to-day as it ever was to monarch or duke in the olden time; — and cease to regard any social arrangments which arose when that fond conceit was cherished as in anywise fixed or binding for the future! This is not, perhaps, a reform, but it is a seed-thought, which, if it could but take root in men's minds, might bring reforms enough in time — and all along the line, instead of in one direction.

Wm. M. Salter.

MATTER AND MOTION.

Science does not reject or exclude any fact, phenomena or force in Nature, whether called mental or non-mental, spiritual, psychical, or physical. Words are only vehicles of thought. We may call all energy and all life spiritual, or cosmical, but how can we affirm its existence abstractly from the concrete forms of life which sentience reveals to consciousness, or antecedently to all matter and motion? We cannot know force apart from matter; how can we know Spirit or Power?

There may be an etherealized form of matter, perceptible rather to intellect than to sense. No doubt there is. There may be "other worlds than ours" in more than the physical sense. But what is Spirit? and what is generally meant by it? Is it not universally a form of force, and really of matter and motion? The savage believes that motion is Spirit. Seeing the rustle of a leaf in his pathway, he fancies that an invisible person, a spirit, moves it. He never thinks to inquire for an impersonal cause, or conceives that the wind can even be impersonal. Indeed, fire and flood, wind, and all natural forces, are to him spirits, persons, because they are specific forms of matter, force, motion, which are to him unintelligible, mysterious. And

is it not so to a greater or less extent with us who claim to be learned? Do we not always attribute to a divine and spiritual agency that which we do not understand and cannot explain scientifically in the objective terms of matter and motion?

Explosions of gas were originally believed, even by the learned, to be the avenging operations of *invisible spirits.*

The devout alchemist began his experiments with prayer, and stamped upon his vessels the mark of the holy cross; — hence the name, *crucible.*

The term *gas* means ghost or spirit.

The very vagueness with which everything connected with the so-called spirit world, the realm of ghosts and shadows, of goblins and demons, is conceived; the great and general disagreement, and utter absence of solid data, concerning it; together with the low origin of the conception, and the fact that increasing light and precision of knowledge give a new and definite interpretation of the phenomena of Nature, and even of Mind,— all tend to show that the so-called spiritual explanation of things is as yet "only the short-cut" of ignorance, is a temporary explanation, which finally will give way to a better and more rational and scientific view.

It would be interesting to follow out some of these rude forms of thought and show the history of this "short-cut" theory of things, revealing the relics and traces of it even among the learned. It underlies most of the metaphysics, as well as the theology, of men. Suffice it to say, here, that this theory reached its fullest and most systematic development in Buddhism, which reckoned six classes of beings in the universe, only two of which, men and gods, are accounted good. The Greeks at first conceived the human soul to be a thin, ethereal substance. They then divided it into two, the animal soul and the rational soul, the life and the mind, the latter being immaterial. The horse and the dog were believed to have *animal* "souls" or "spirits." Until the dawn of modern science, most diseases and calamities were believed to be the work of evil spirits. It is curious, in this connection, to note that most Europeans were wont to conceive the demons as black, while the negroes of Africa supposed them to be white.

Now, whether we attribute the occurrences of Nature and Life, the phenomena of matter and motion, to one spirit or to many, the principle and method are the same. It is an unphilosophic assumption, utterly lacking in proof, and which the progress of science, or systematic inquiry, is continually removing. It is true there is a realm of thought, a region unknown; we know but little of the workings of force, or of its nature; but there is no more

reason to call it spirit than to call it matter. We know nothing of it independently of the qualities of matter, as matter itself evinces force.

And right here, I desire to observe, is really the essential point of difference between the spiritualist and the materialist schools. The one claims to know life apart from its embodiment, and as something of a different nature existing anteriorly and independently. The other claims that what we term the phenomena of matter, and treat with more or less contempt, are really inherent in the universal Life,— are only various manifestations of Life, and essential parts of it. We distinguish them, by the intellectual artifice of abstraction, simply for convenience, just as we do gravity and heat, sound and color. Life, in other words, is a process, a great chain of evolution, having many links, not all of which have as yet become known or visible to us.

So of Mind, Consciousness, Thought, as well as Sensation and Emotion. They are not entities existing outside of, and antecedently to, the concretes which we cognize; but are potential forces in the great womb of Nature,— or, may we not say, of "God," if this be sufficiently explicit for philosophic reasoning? That certain forms, or all known forms, of organic life, have a certain periodicity, or limit, — run a brief course, mature, and die,— does not prove that Life has not forever had a concrete, actual existence, and is not essentially concrete. Nature itself is concrete; and while, for convenience' sake, we imagine something to have existed before Nature, and to have caused Nature, calling it "Spirit," and "God," let us be consistent, and admit that we cannot define this something, or "somewhat," which we call Spirit and "God," except as a term of thought, as a mental abstraction,— *Nature being the only reality.* We cannot find, and need not seek, anything beyond!

Our search resolves itself into this: Is Nature one, or is it dual?— matter alone, or spirit alone, or matter *and* spirit?

According to the view of Mr. Spencer and Mr. Lewes, matter and motion are as eternal and indestructible as force itself. But what we mean by force takes a precedence in our thought, and we anthropomorphize or personify it. We endow it with the attributes or qualities of our own selves, and so worship it as the source of all things,—things being concrete bodies. We have, thus, what is known in metaphysics as Idealism and Transcendentalism. It is the side of Mysticism, Theology, Religion.

But it is essentially subjective, the human out-look, or attitude of viewing things,— *a priori* and traditional, and

without authority from induction or science. Science finds sentience, thought, mind, in the evolutions of Nature. It seeks to define, to determine, and know the methods or laws of Nature. And the chief controversy now is, whether the order of Nature is mechanical,—governed, as we say, by fixed, *i. e.*, definite and determinable, laws. Science assumes and works from such datum as this as its basis, and all the important discoveries, not only in Astronomy and Physics, but in Morals and Sociology, have been made by the aid of this postulate or hypothesis.

On the other hand, it is contended that the phenomena of Evolution and Life do not come within the hypothesis, that there is an indeterminable Unknowable,—a something greater than Nature, which may and does break in upon Nature's order, which surprises and confounds the scientist by miracles.

To discuss this question, from either its theological or scientific side, comes not within the scope or purpose of this essay. I have sought simply to take a natural, common-sense look at things as they are, from the stand-point of modern knowledge of Force, Matter and Motion, inclining to the conviction that what is thought of as Spirit, and worshiped as God, is only human consciousness or thought of Matter, Motion, Force,—eternal, mysterious realities whether treated either as concrete or abstract.

A. N. Adams.

CORRESPONDENCE.

COMPETITION AND CO-OPERATION.

Mr. Editor:—

Rev. M. J. Savage, criticizing the position of W. S. Lilly, as defined in an article entitled "The Ethics of Property," printed in the February *Forum*, says in a recent sermon: "Whether we like it or not, as I have told you before, competition is the method of the universe, and has been from the first; and I do not believe that men can escape it, any more than they can escape the air they breathe."

Well, if we cannot escape it, we may *elevate* it; and this is what the essayist would like to see done. Mr. Savage's entire reference to Mr. Lilly's "theory" gives, I think, a wrong impression in regard to it. Mr. Lilly says: "To get out of men the utmost exertion of which they are capable for the smallest wages they can be induced to accept, is very widely supposed to sum up the whole duty of an employer toward his 'hands.' We have forgotten that these hands are men. We have treated them as merely animated machines. Well, I say, unhesitatingly, that to pit a destitute man against his destitute fellows, and to wring from him his labor for the scantiest pittance to which he can be ground down, is wrong. The necessity of the seller does not make it just to underpay him. If I give him less than a *justum pretium*, an equitable price for his work, I in fact rob him. And this is at

once the most common and the most disgraceful form of theft. The most common, for it is found in all departments of life; the most disgraceful, because it is the most cowardly. . . . It may, however, be said [and this is what Mr. Savage, in substance, says], 'Everywhere throughout Nature, variety and competition are the conditions of advance.' The struggle for existence is indeed the universal rule of Nature; but the business of man, who is an ethical animal having perception of right and wrong, justice and injustice, is to moralize the struggle."

Mr. Lilly thinks that "the task which lies before the world is the reorganization of industry upon an ethical basis. The era is surely approaching when, in Mr. Herbert Spencer's happy words, 'One man will not be suffered to enjoy without working, that which another produces without enjoying'; when what Mr. Mill calls 'the great social evil of a non-laboring class' will no longer be tolerated; when the true answer to Socialism, with its barbarous schemes for the abolition of Capital, will be given by the vast extension of Co-operation, which will make every laborer a capitalist. Co-operation! That word is a key to a solution of the great problem. . . . It seems to me not easy to overrate the disastrous effect upon national life that must result, in proportion as the State assumes the function of the father, the master, the guild, the church. I believe the new industrial organization that the world must have will be a natural growth, not an artificial machine,—a growth rooted in the essential needs of human nature, which are ethical needs; in the regulative principles of human action, which are ethical principles; in the mighty hopes that make us men, which are ethical hopes."

These words define the reasonable and hopeful position of Mr. Lilly, to the moral height and humanitarian spirit of which Mr. Savage's sermon does not rise.

B. F. Underwood.

THE LABOR QUESTION: IS IT MORAL OR ECONOMIC?

Dear Mr. West:—

None will deny that there is room for moral culture among the poor. An old saying has it that when poverty enters the door love flies out of the window. There is, however, a class of writers who constantly strive to spread the idea that there is really no "Labor Question," but *only* a Moral Question. And in their view its solution is simple. It is only needful that the laborer should, figuratively speaking, lift himself by the bootstraps to a higher moral plane.

The recent contributions to your columns by Mrs. Dietrick and Mr. Powell are cases in point. As one of the class thus severely held to account I ask for a hearing in its defense, against what I consider unjust aspersions. "Instruct them; then they will become well-off," says, in effect, Mrs. Dietrick. "Make them well-off; then instruct them," wrote Confucius. "We must not fool ourselves with economic panaceas," says Mr. Powell.

The meaning of the first-mentioned writers is clear, but mutually conflicting; that of the latter not so clear. What, in Mr. Powell's definition of the term, *is* an "economic panacea"? Is it legislative interference in economic matters, or is it an effort to abolish such interference? Or does he think that legislation pertaining to the distribution of wealth has nothing to do with the welfare of the toilers, and does not belong to the question at issue?

If Mr. Powell will look them over he will find that the efforts of

agitators are to-day distinguished by an anxiety to *get rid* of the "panaceas" that have beguiled us, and to return to free and natural conditions between nations, between man and man, and between man and the soil he lives on. My belief is, that, self-preservation being the first law of Nature, conditions inimical to physical health must be also inimical to mental and moral vigor, and that "panaceas" that have produced vast wealth on one hand, and squalor, leading to mental and moral degradation, on the other, have, to use Mr. Powell's fit expression, "fooled" us grievously indeed.

Respectfully, F. HARMER.

GENERAL TOPICS.

THE OTHER SIDE.

"THE other side" is always welcome to representation in our pages — limited only by the limits of space.

PARACELSUS — SORDELLO.

WHILE Mr. Holland, in the present issue, writes in his pleasant way of Browning's "Paracelsus," and of the fine little *brochure* by Mrs. Holy explanatory of that poem, it may be well to remind our readers that Mr. Holland himself has a fine little *brochure* on another of Browning's poems,— "Sordello." They make very good companion pamphlets. Both are included in our advertising pages.

UNITARIANISM.

THE *Christian Register*, in its issue for March 13, makes our heart leap within us. It says:

> In our thought and feeling, Unitarianism is simply the name that means our highest conceptions of religious truth, the truest, freest, and best possible interpretation of the Christian religion, in the light of modern science and modern thought; and this is why we are loyal to the name.

Dear heart! if this were only *meant*. And if Unitarianism as a whole, including that on Beacon Hill and that at Cambridge, would only mean this! Why, if this be *meant*, the editor of THE NEW IDEAL may yet become a Unitarian minister! And there are others. Would they be welcome? At present their earnestly desired life-work is at a serious stand-still, and they are waiting Marching Orders. "*Our highest conceptions of religious truth — in the light of modern science and modern thought.*" Ah, but minister after minister is compelled to "leave" — one almost every month — because they find, as the editor of THE NEW IDEAL fears *he* would find, that the emphasis, when it came to the deep-souled, critical moment, would not be, as above, on the whole of the italicized phrases, but only on the first word of the same, — "*Our* highest con-

ceptions,"— to which every other person would be expected to conform! If we are wrong in this it will be a good work indeed for the *Christian Register* to set us right.

THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN.

The many readers who were interested in the articles printed in The New Ideal last year, entitled "What shall Liberals do with their Children?" will be glad to learn of the recent little pamphlet by Mrs. Underwood, referred to among the Book Notices. After discussion particularly of the *religious* education of the children of Rationalists, including the question of religious instruction in the public schools, certain passages occur which we are especially glad to quote:

One step in the right education of the children of Liberals would be in the establishment of Sunday schools where purely ethical teaching should prevail, disassociated from all blind guessing at the unknown; where man's needs and possibilities, his power to aid and to hinder the happiness of his fellows should be explained and made clear, the reasons made plain why we *ought* or ought *not* to do certain things, and the way to further intellectual and moral evolution pointed out.

One thing is clear and certain — that the moral sense, the conscience, of the rising generation should in every way be aroused, developed, and strengthened, and that children should be thoroughly instructed in the precepts of morality, and, as soon as they are able to understand them, in the principles of ethics. This, of course, implies a knowledge of man's history and relations to his fellow-men and to the world. That only should be taught as unquestionable truth which is beyond reasonable controversy. The world's knowledge is constantly increasing, and propositions which are not susceptible of proof should not be taught in a way to limit further inquiry. Philosophical and religious speculations, concerning which the greatest thinkers of all ages have differed, cannot be accepted as truth by immature minds, save upon the dicta of authority, and it is manifestly unjust to impose upon the young in this way theories that are open to doubt. It is better as the young mind develops to acquaint it with the *pros* and *cons* of all disputed questions, the arguments for and the objections to each side, and allow it to form its own conclusions.

Some may say that in limiting the education of the young to the known and proven deprives it of the uplifting impetus which the search after the infinite and the unknown gives. To this our answer is that Liberalism does not seek to limit the *search* after the now unknown, or to forbid making it sure wherever possible. It does forbid building air-castles with no sign of a foundation. Search and inquiry are the legitimate tools of progressive men and women, but they refuse to theorize on what is unknown until their search has revealed something definite and tangible.

Because we cannot allow our children to rhapsodize over visionary joys, are they, as some profess to think, shut off from the blessed enthusiasms which make life better worth living? Indeed *no!* Though we may not be able to shout hallelujahs over imaginary joys or triumphs, yet we can teach our children to find exaltation and delight in work for the uplifting of humanity. We can teach them to help bring happiness to themselves and to mankind by seeking to lessen the hours of toil for the laborer, to make his hours of leisure intellectually profitable — to give him his due

share of the profits gained by his work; in efforts to give strength to weak bodies and weaker minds; to help make hearts purer and intellect stronger; to win men and women to deal justly by each other; to make the waste places of the earth productive until it gives us its best; to bring Nature and man up to their highest possibilties, and by united action prove the brotherhood of man before wasting time in blind guessing as to the fatherhood of a God who chooses for some unknown reason to keep himself beyond mortal ken. So, working unitedly toward the realization of the highest ideals we yet know, we may become clear-eyed and large-brained enough to search more deeply, more clear-sightedly, and more successfully into the mysteries of the universe and approach more nearly the yet unknown truth which quarrelsome guesses seem to push farther and farther away from us. There remain to all the heights of philosophy — aye, even of spiritual inquiry — to ascend, by as slow or as swift degree as within us lies. We are not shut off from that ascension; but we have no right, at the foot of those heights, to shut our eyes and declare definitely what those unseen summits hold of ineffable presence and power.

SALESWOMEN AND CHILDREN.

We extract without comment, from the recent report prepared by the Working Women's Society of New York city, the following instructive items. Side by side with them, perhaps, might well be reprinted Mrs. Moore's poem in the March New Ideal, "The Racer." The report has reference to the condition of saleswomen and children in the retail dry-goods stores, and "the facts were gathered through personal interviews, and from sources known to be trustworthy."

1. *The hours are frequently excessive, and overtime is not paid for.* In the Grand street stores the employees commence at 8 A. M. and work "until 6 P. M.," with half an hour for lunch, except on Saturday when they are kept until 10, 11, and 12 o'clock at night. But in most of the stores the saleswomen and children are kept after six o'clock, to arrange stock, from one to five hours, according to the season. For three or four weeks before the holidays they are obliged to remain until 11 or 12 o'clock every night, marking goods, without supper and without extra pay. Employees are not engaged for a certain number of hours, but for such time as they are wanted; thus a child working for $1.50 or $2.00 a week may be required to work 16 or 17 hours at certain seasons.

2. *Work is, in many instances, done under insanitary conditions,* such as bad ventilation and insanitary toilet arrangements.

3. *Excessive fines are enforced in many stores which greatly reduce the wages received.* In a number of instances from 10 to 30 cents are deducted for being 5 or 10 minutes late in the morning, or in returning from lunch. Mistakes in change must be borne by the saleswomen making them. In one store the fines amounted last year to $3,000. In one case the fines of a saleswoman between Sept. 1st and Jan'y 1st of last year amounted to $15. A little girl in the fur-department of a certain house, who was already a skillful seller, was fined 60 cents in one week out of a salary of $2.00. These fines are usually divided between the superintendent and the timekeeper, who imposes them. In one case the superintendent was heard blaming the timekeeper for fining too lightly.

4. *The wages received are inadequate for the women to live on.*

The average salary does not exceed $7, and in the majority of cases it is about $4 or 4.50. Cash-girls receive $1.50 to $2.50, the latter price being paid in only one house so far as is known to this society. Yet these salaries are often greatly reduced by fines as shown above.

The tendency is to employ the cheapest help. Advertisements are frequent for girls just out of school, who live at home, and can work for less than older women who have to board. Faithful employees are often dismissed without cause, simply for this reason, after they have been with a house for five or six years. A woman who was pleading to be retained, was answered in one case: "This is not an orphan-asylum or a house of refuge."

In one instance, we find the employees are paid twice a month for two weeks' work, and thus a week is given to the firm every three months, or four weeks a year.

5. *An injurious effect physically and morally is produced* on employees through low wages, long hours, excessive fines, and unwholesome sanitary conditions.

Saleswomen are compelled to dress well, and must have a room somewhere for which they pay rent or board. They must save first on food, and consequently many suffer severely because of insufficient nutrition. The result sooner or later is a physical breaking down of the system. It is almost impossible to live at all on the wages many receive. Is it any wonder that many should seek to eke out a living in unlawful ways, and are driven, not willingly, to lives of sin? That there are such cases is well known. The wonder is rather that there are not more, when the work is severe, the hours long, and the remuneration so scanty.

DEATH OF JUDGE J. W. NORTH.

Another active worker in Rationalistic lines has recently lain down to rest. From the San Francisco *Freethought* we abridge the following notice. Always an interested and generous helper, Judge North was a subscriber to The New Ideal from the first.

Judge J. W. North, the humanitarian, the old-time abolitionist, the freethinker, and first vice-president of the California State Liberal Union, is dead. He died at Fresno, February 22, in the 76th year of his age. No technically religious services were held over his remains prior to their leaving Fresno, but in place of such services the family and intimate friends gathered about the casket, and appropriate remarks were made by Dr. Chester Rowell. The remains were then shipped to Los Angeles, to be cremated. The cremation of his body was at his special request, as were the absence of any floral or other display.

John Wesley North was born in Rensselaer county, N. Y., in 1815. He graduated from the Wesleyan University at Middleton, Conn., in August, 1841. During his college life he became a zealous worker in the anti-slavery cause, and for two years lectured under the auspices of the Connecticut State Anti-Slavery Society. After leaving college he studied law in New York and Syracuse, and was admited to the bar in 1845. In August, 1848, he was married to Miss Ann H. Loomis of Onondaga county, N. Y., who survives him. In 1849, his health failing, a change of climate became necessary, and he moved to Minnesota, living the first year of his residence in that territory, on Hennepin island, in the Mississippi river, and seeing during that time the building of the first house on the site of the present prosperous city of Minneapolis.

In the fall of 1850 he was elected a member of the second legis-

lature of the territory of Minnesota, and introduced the bill chartering the Minnesota University, a well-endowed and useful educational institution still in existence at Minneapolis. He was largely instrumental in settling the town of Faribault, and he founded the thriving town of Northfield, so called in his honor. In 1857 he was a member of the Constitutional Convention that framed the constitution of the new State of Minnesota. In 1860 he was chairman of the Minnesota delegation in the Chicago convention, and was a member of the committee that waited upon Abraham Lincoln to notify him of his nomination for the presidency. In 1861 he was appointed surveyor-general of the territory of Nevada, and subsequently judge of the territorial district supreme court of Nevada. In the fall of 1865 he returned to the East, locating at Knoxville, Tenn., where he labored assiduously for the improvement and development of that State. In March, 1870, he conceived the idea of establishing a colony of Eastern people in Southern California, and at once commenced the development and execution of his plan. How well he succeeded all who have visited or lived in Riverside can testify. This thriving city was the result of his scheme. Having seen the child of his fancy outgrow his fondest hopes, in 1879 he removed to San Francisco, and the following year connected himself with the Washington colony, in Fresno county, which section he did much to settle. His latest enterprise in the way of Liberal work was the establishing of the Unity Society at Fresno, of which he was made president.

In the language of his published obituary, "he died peacefully, in the midst of his family, his long life filled with good deeds, and leaving behind him that most priceless of legacies, a name without reproach. In character he was remarkably free from guile or pretense of any sort. Full of a courage that shrank from nothing in the redressing of another's wrong or the establishment of a principle, he was always found upon the side of the oppressed. Generous to a fault, he was always in the lead when private loss or public improvement stood in need of pecuniary aid, and his integrity and high moral standard made him a model man."

So passes away one of Nature's noblest noblemen. He was a man without fear, without superstition, incapable of a dishonest word or act. "And as he lived he died. Proudly he entered the darkness — or the dawn — that we call death. Unshrinkingly he passed beyond our horizon, beyond the twilight's purple hills, beyond the utmost reach of human harm or help — to that vast realm of silence or of joy where the innumerable dwell; and he has left with us his wealth of thought and deed — the memory of a brave, imperious, honest man who bowed alone to death."

BOOK REVIEWS.

Our Heredity from God. Lectures on Evolution. By E. P. Powell. Fourth Edition. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Pages, 423. $1.75.

That this book is already in its fourth edition proves that it meets a need, or has created one. And it does meet a need. One can hardly find, elsewhere, so popular and suggestive a setting forth of the facts, theories and prophecies of the Evolution hypothesis. And inasmuch as the author discards, as he tells us in his preface, all theological implications in his use of the word "God," even the most radically inclined can read his book, and enjoy and be helped by it. "I have used the word God," he says, "as well as other words charged with extra-naturalism, although it would be better if their use could be supplanted. It

will not, however, be misleading to careful readers." On another page, he says: "This book is dedicated to all those who, like the author, have lost faith in authoritative Revelation, in hopes that they, like himself, may find satisfaction in that revelation of Eternal Life and Truth which is steadily unfolded to us by Science." All parts of the book are instructive, and while they instruct they never fail to interest. The driest facts of the Evolution problem are made plain, and happily illustrated. But it is in such chapters as close the work,—"The eyes of Evolution in its Forehead," "Ethics the aim in Evolution," "That last enemy, Death,"—that the interest culminates and the purpose of the work is seen. No one will regret owning and reading Mr. Powell's work.

Liberty and Life: Seventeen Discourses, by E. P. Powell, author of "Our Heredity from God." Chicago, Charles H. Kerr & Co., 1889. Pages, 208. 75 cents.

These discourses are all from the standpoint of Evolution,—are in some sense a supplement to the volume mentioned above,—and all wisely and practically touch human life, in its most human and needy aspects. The topics are as follows: Life and Death, what they are; Sin a Crime Against Life—Righteousness Obedience to Law; Sinning Against the Holy Spirit; A Sound Mind in a Sound Body; Is the Average Life Worth the Living? The True, the Beautiful and the Good; Not Allopathy nor Homeopathy, but Sympathy; The True Life; The Doing Creed; The Keys; A Bundle of Paradoxies; A Substitute for Orthodoxy; The Two Theologies; Natural Moral Compensation; Character; The Religion of the Future; New Year's in 1982. The clear, direct style of the discourses is such that no one can read them without feeling that he is being personally commanded to a cleaner, purer, more intelligent and proper kind of life. Old religious fallacies, and modern ones as well, are sturdily set in the background; but the book is one long call to the activities of a true religion—that religion which is a consciously attained harmony with Nature's highest physical and noblest spiritual laws.

The Signs of the Times: Twelve Sermons. By M. J. Savage. Boston: Geo. H. Ellis, 1889. Pages, 187. $1.00.

This book is dedicated "To the increasing numbers, in all sects, who are coming to discern the signs of the times more and more clearly." The topics are these: Break-up of the Old Orthodoxy, The Roman Church, Liberal Orthodoxy, Unitarianism, Free Religion and Ethical Culture, Scientific Materialism, Ingersollism, Religious Reaction, Mind Cure, Spiritualism, Break-ups that mean Advance, The New City of God. To say that these discourses are by Mr. Savage is to say that they are clear-cut, popular presentations of the themes under discussion. If we do not agree with all that we read—and we are not called upon to agree—we at least have, when we conclude, a more intelligent idea than ever before of the drift and tendencies of a dozen timely and important topics. They give much of the author's personal experience, and it is unnecessary to add that all are readable.

Helps for Daily Living. Ten Sermons, by M. J. Savage. Boston: Geo. H. Ellis, 1889. Pages, 150. $1.00.

For motto, on his title-page, Mr. Savage writes: "The true hero is the helper"; and the Dedication of the book is suggestive and spurring to the many who, because they cannot do great things, most often do nothing: "To all those who, knowing they can help but little, are still ready to help all they can." The topics are these: Life's Aim and Meaning, Things that Make Honesty Hard, The Self and Others, The Problem of Evil, Life's Petty Worries, The Commonplace, Helping, Conflicts of Conscience, Living by the Day, How to Die. It will be seen that these are all homely, commonplace topics;—but the majority of men and women are homely and commonplace also, and all such will certainly find many wise, suggestive, sympathetic words here,—words which, if taken to heart, will not fail to ease life's way.

The Education Question among Liberals. An Essay by Mrs. Sara A. Underwood. Boston: J. P. Mendum, *Investigator* Office, 1890. Pamphlet, 24 pages.

Comment on this pamphlet, with quotation, is given among the "General Topics." The entire discussion is intelligent and forceful. Mrs. Underwood perhaps never wrote anything more helpful.

THE NEW IDEAL.

Contents of Volume III.—1890.

JANUARY.

EDITORIAL—

General Topics: THE NEW IDEAL MAGAZINE; Liberalism's Spiritual Aim; The New Salvation of the World; Orthodoxy and Unitarianism; A Rational Response-Book for Sunday Schools; The Root of the Temperance Question; Western "Unitarianism"; Our Wage-Earning Contributor; "Liberal Religion"; "Is His Arm Shortened?" Body and Spirit, ... 1

GENERAL CONTRIBUTIONS—

The Spiritual Aim of Liberalism, ... O. B. FROTHINGHAM 8
Professor Fisher and the Bible, ... HON. A. N. ADAMS 10
Organized Labor, ... LAURENCE GRONLUND 12
Religion and Morality from the Spencerian Point of View, ... SYLVAN DREY 16
Extracts from an Unpublished Essay on Immortality, ... HON. GEO. F. TALBOT 18
Bellamy Criticized, ... WM. J. POTTER 24
Illusion (Poem), ... A. C. BOWEN 28
The Let-Alone Policy, ... GEO. H. HADLEY 28
In Sorrow's Presence (Poem), ... HORACE L. TRAUBEL 31
Fatalistic Science and Human Self-Determination, III., ... DR. EDMUND MONTGOMERY 31
Peter and His Island: An Allegory, ... F. M. HOLLAND 36
Why Propagate Evolution Views? ..... DR. LEWIS G. JANES 41

CORRESPONDENCE—

"Two Views of Life," ..... NELLY BOOTH SIMMONS 43

NOTES—

The F. R. A. Lectures, ... EDWIN D. MEAD 44

FEBRUARY.

EDITORIAL—

General Topics: Poverty and Character; The F. R. A. Social Science Lectures; Editor Todd on Temperance; Mr. Martin's Rational Service-Book; A "Liberal" Woman-Suffrage Association; Nature-Deep; Fourteen Years Among the Poor; The Question of Taxation; A Popular Complaint at Last Answered; "Concerning Christmas," 45

GENERAL CONTRIBUTIONS—

Bellamy's Critic Criticized, ... REV. W. G. TODD 49
Where is the Remedy? ..... MRS. ELLEN B. DIETRICK 54
The Relativity of Knowledge, ... DR. ROBT. G. ECCLES 58
The Holy Spirit of Nature (Poem), ... MRS. J. A. HARMON 63
Concerning Christmas, ... CHAS. K. WHIPPLE 63
Good Without God, ... CAPT. ROBT. C. ADAMS 69
Extracts from an Unpublished Essay on Immortality, ... HON. GEO. F. TALBOT 73
Deity Omnipresent and Omnipotent, ... REV. PERRY MARSHALL 79
Christianity and Forgiveness, ... JAMES H. WEST 82

CORRESPONDENCE—

To Liberal Women, ... MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE 91
How to Help the Colored Man, ... F. M. HOLLAND 92

NOTES—

Felicitation, ... O. B. FROTHINGHAM 92
Looking Forward, ... EDWARD BELLAMY 92
A Lofty Purpose, ... DR. EDMUND MONTGOMERY 92